Icann has never balanced the right to privacy and the “need for information”. The status quo has been that users have no privacy what-so-ever.

On rare occasions where the individual benefits, it is almost uniformly the case that time is spent on attempting to find a way to circumvent the regulation to maintain the benefit to corporations at the expense of end users.

The idea that more time is required when you have known about the GDPR for two years is absurd. Such a request should rightfully be denied.

The dishonesty contained in the “fragmentation”-claim is astounding. If you allow for "no personal data", you do not have to worry about fragmentation. But no such consideration is made because at a fundamental level, icann does not respect privacy.

As for the adversely affected categories, it is interesting to note that icann believes copyright holders have a special status in society equal to law enforcement. This would seem to be completely in line with the general understanding of the interests icann represents.